GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

FOOD, CIVIL SUPPLIES AND LABOUR DEPARTMENT.

Labour Dispute:—Industrial Dispute between the Workmen and the Management of Saroja Textiles, No. 5, Ganigar 'C' Lane Cubbonpet, Bangalore—2.

Award of the Labour Court, Bangalore—Published.

Read the following papers :—

(1) Letter No. 2615/70-71. dated 12th March 1971, from Sri A. N. Sundara Murthy, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Bangalore.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT BANGALOR.

Dated this 12th day of March 1971.

Present :

Sri A. N. Sundara Murthy, BA., BL.,

Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 64 of 1968

I Party: Workmen represented by the General Secretary, Bangalore Jilla Silk Karmika Sangha, 70, Arcot Srinivasachar Street, Bangalore-2.

VS

II Party: The Management of Saroja Textiles, No. 5, Ganigar 'C' Lane, Cubbonpet, Bangalore-2.

Reference : Government Order No. FCL 473 LLD 68, dated 8th October 1968.

AWARD

1. The Government of Mysore in their Order No. FCL 473 LLD 68, dated 8th October 1968 have referred an industrial dispute existing between the above said parties to this court for adjudiaction on the points of dispute noted below :—

> "Is the Management of M/s. Saroja Textiles. No. 5, Ganigar 'C' Lane, Cubbonpet, Bangalore-2 justified in terminating the services of the following workmen:
>
> Sri C. Muthu Sri Byalappa

Sri Aswatha — Smt. Thimmakka, and
Sri Ranganathan, — Smt. Lakshmi

If not, are the above workmen entitled for reinstatement with back wages and continuity of services or any other relief?"

2. On behalf of the first party claim statement is filed as follows:—The proprietrix of the second party, namely, Smt. A. Krishnamma dismissed the first party workers, namely, Thimmakka and Lakshmamma from their servirces on 18th August 1967 without assigning any reason, without any charge-sheet or without enquiry and without notice of termination. When they questioned the proprietrix for the reason for termination they were told that they were not required for work. In this behalf on 24th August 1967 the Secretary of the first party union addressed a letter to the second party and no reply was received. Similarly the first party workers, namely, G. Muthu, Aswatha and Ranganathan were dismissed from service by the second party on 28th August 1967 without any notice, enquiry or any valid reason. Again similarly the services of the first party workman Bylappa were terminated on 25th August 1967. The Secretary of the Union on their behalf demanded their reinstatement with back wages as per the letter, dated 30th August 1967 After victimising Venkataramu, the Secretary of the Union the second party wanted to get rid of all the workers suspected to be the members of the Union which tried to enforce the provisions of the Factories Act such as maintenance of proper registers, weekly holiday, payment of wages on a fixed for weavers, leave books and leave with wages. On the complaint made by the union the Inspector of Factories visited the second party and enforced the provisions of law which annoyed the second party management. Conciliation proceedings were initiated at the instance of the first party union. The second party did not attend the conciliation proceedings. The action of the second party in terminating the services of the first party workmen is unjust, illegal and *mala fide* The second party management has resorted to unfair labour practice and has victimised the employees for having enrolled themselves as members of the first party union with a view to better their conditions of service. The first party workmen are entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages.

3. On behalf of the second party rejoinder is filed as follows:—It is denied that the second party terminated the services of the first party workmen. It is all the mischief of M. C. Venkataramu, the Secretary of the first party union was thrown out of services by the second party for his misconduct. The said Venkataramu with a vengence has withdrawn the other workmen from srvice of the second party without any justification whatsoever th tehe hope of oisting a case of dismissal and making extravagent

demands of empensation and back wages and also with view to kill the industry on oaccount of anticapitalistic views of the first party union. The second party never refused work to the workmen nor asked them to go awiay It the first party that is guilty of seducing the workmen and with-holding them from work with a view to cause wrongful loss to the second party. The second party is thereby compelled to shrink its business and allow its looms to remain unused for the most part and thus incurring heavy loss in business. The second party did not know anything about labour laws. When the first party wrote undignified, false and threatening letters, the management of the second party ignored the letters as they contained patent falsehoods. The first party managed to get a reference being made on false statements taking care to see that the second party's voice was not heard. The second party after receipt of notice had approached the Myosre State Employer's Association and became a member thereof. The Secretary of the Association who was representing the second party asked for an adjournment as he could not attend unavoidably on 23rd February 1968. But the proceedings were closed without any opportunity to the second party. The reference is bad in as much as it proceeds on the false assumption that the second party terminated the services of the workmen named in the reference and it is liable to be rejected on that ground. The second party has always been and even now willing to entertain the first party workmen with continuity of service. But it is not prepared to give them idle wages for the period they have stayed away from work on their own volition. Since the first party workmen stayed away without the consent of the second party they are not entitled to any of the reliefs. It is prayed that the reference may be rejected with costs.

4. The following issues are framed :—

(1) Whether the services of I-party workmen were unjustifiably terminated by II Party ?

or

Whether I Party workmen stayed away from work ?

(2) Whether I Party workmen are entitled to reinstatement with back wages ?

5. It is admitted on behalf of the first party that two of the first party workmen, namely, Aswatha and Ranganathan have effected a settlement with the second party. In view of this fact the reference in respect of the said two workers does not survive.

6. The main point for consideration in this case is whether the second party unjustifiably terminated the services of first party workmen, Muthu. Bylappa, Thimmakka and Lakshmi or the said

workers stayed away from work. In 1963 II LLJ 638 the Supreme Court has laid down as follows:—

> "Abandonment or relinquisment of service is always a question of intention, and, normally such an intention cannot be attributed to an employee without adequate evidence in that behalf.

Bearing in mind the principles laid down in the above said decision the facts and circumstances of this case will have to be scrutinised to come to the conclusion whether the above said four first party workmen abandoned their services or whether their services were unjustifiably terminated by the second party.

7. G. Muthu, W. W. 1, in his evidence states that on 22nd August 1967 the second party terminated his services without issuing any notice on 23rd August 1967 he went to the second party again and demanded work. The second party stated that he would not be provided with work he complained to the union he states that the services of Thimmakka and Lakshmi were also terminated 2 or 3 days before his services were terminated. He had joined the first party union 2 or 3 months before his services were terminated. Bylappa, Thimmakka and Lakshmi were also members of the said union W. W. 2 Venkataramu is the Secretary of the union. After his services were terminated the second party was hostile to the union. After a complaint was made by Venkataramu and after the Factory Inspector came and inspected the factory they were issued leave card.

8. W. W. 2 Venkataramu states that he is the Secretary of the first party union. His services were terminated even prior to the present dispute The union was started in April 1967. The workers of the second party are the members of the union. He complained to the Inspector of Factories to enforce labour laws. For his trade union activity his services were terminated in August 1967. In that behalf a dispute was raised. The said dispute was referred to this court in Reference No. 3/68 This Court ordered his reinstatement with back wages. He was taken back for duty for one week and thereafter once again his services were terminated on account of his trade union activity. Thereafter on 18th August 1967 Thimmakka and Lakshmi came and reported to him that their services were terminated due to union activity. In that behalf he wrote a letter to the second party. Ex W. 1 is a copy of it. Muthu W. W. 1, Aswatha and Ranganatha came and reported to him that their services were terminated on 22nd August 967. W. W. 3 Bylappa came and reported to him that his services were terminated on 25th August 1967. Thereafter he sent a letter to the second party. Ex. W. 2 is a copy of it. No reply was received to the above said two letters. He denies that he told the first party workmen not to attend to their duties and accordingly they did not attend to their work.

9. W. W. 3, Bylappa states in his evidence that he is a member of the first party union and that W W 2, is the Secretary. The second party terminated his services on 25th August 1967. On 25th August 1967. when he went to duty as u ual Subr manyappa and Krishnamma called him to the Office and they stated that he should sign the leave register stating that they would make payment. H stated that he put his signature to the leave register, but no Payment was made. He could not read English. He admits that Ex. W. 3, bears his signature. He states that he does not know what is written therein From 22nd August 1967 to 25th August 1967 he attended to his duty. He states that the date put on the revenue stamp fixed to Ex. W 3, as 21st August 1967 is not put by him. On 25th August 967 he was not paid leave with wages. He admits that the second party paid his pay He admits that Ex. W 4 (a) is his signature. Prior to him Lakshmi. Thimmakka and Muthu were removed from their services. They were all removed from their services because they joined the union. He denies that Venkataramu W. W. 2 advised him to stop away from work and they could file a case and get a lot of money.

10. In the course of cross-examination he states that in Ex. w. 4 (a) it is stated that he has received Rs. 33 but he states that he received Rs. 30 and odd and Rs. 28 and odd. He did not protest and complain to the union. He states that there was no misunderstanding between himself and the second party at the time of Ex. w 3 and (4) (a) and he states that after he received the amount he did not go near the factory for work. He admits that on 15th August 1967 a sum of Rs. 20 was received by him as advance and that was deducted in his pay.

11 On behalf of the second party M W.1. M. Sathyanarayana Rao clerk of the second party and M.W 1 Subramanyappa the husband of Krishnamma probrietrix of the second party concern are examined. M. W. 1 states that the second party concern was closed four months ago. He was maintaining the attendance register and attending to the correspondence of the second party. He states that he had made the entries in Ex. W. 4 except for the month of January 1967. He states that G. Muthu, (W W 1), Aswatha, Rangantha, Bylappa (W W. 3), Thimmakka and Lakshmi absented from 22nd August 1967 2nd August 1967. 21st August 1967, 22nd August 1967, 17th August 1967 and 18th August 1967 respectively. He states that the said persons had not appeared at the factory after the date they absented from the work He states that in Ex W. 4 as per Ex. M. 1 he has made an entry in respect of W. W. stating that he left the service from 21st August 1967. At that time W.W 3 was not due in any sum by way of advance When the sum of Rs. 33 was paid to W. W. 3 he was also present.

12. M. W. 2 states that he is running the second party concern on behalf of his wife. He states that they did not remove the first

party workmen from their service. Theyabandoned their services on different adtes. He does not know why they stopped away from work. He received a letter from the first party union. He gave the letter to Sri Puttananjappa the Secretary of the Employers, Association. He sent for the first party workmen. Inspite of it they did not turn up. He did not take any other workmen in their place He states that Bylappa (W.W. 3) Ranganath and Aswatha settled their claims and went away.

13. It is contended on behalf of the second party that W.W 3 Bylappa has voluntarily left his services settling his accounts with the second party and hence the reference in respect of W.W 3 does surveive At the earliest stage on behalf of W. W. 3 and other three workmen a letter was addressed to the second party by the first party union as per Ex. w 2 stating that the services of W. W. 3 were unjustifiably terminated with effect from 25th August 1967. The second party did not challenge this version sending a reply. In this case in the claim statemens filed by the first party it is clearly stated that the services of W. W. 3 Bylappa were terminated on 25th August 1967. In the rejoinder it is stated that he stayed away from his work without the consent of the second party. In view of these fects no issue is raised stating whether W. W 3 Bylappa voluntarily gave up his job after settling his claims with the second party. In view of fhese facts it will not be open to the second party at this stage to contend that W. W. 3 Bylappa stayed away from work after settling his claims with the second party. Even granting such a question could be gone into, in view of the fact that the second party has adduced evidence in that behalff it will have to be seen whether that evidence could be accepted. In the course of the evidence of M. W. 1 he states that W W. 3 Bylappa absented from 22nd August 1967. Ex. W. 4 is the Adults Master Roll and Wages Register. Ex M. 1 is the relevant entry made by M. W. 1 stating "left his service from 21st August 1967" He states that in his presence W. W 3 received Rs 33 M W. 2 states that W. W 3 has settled his claims. He states that at the time of Ex. W. 3 he paid Rs. 25 to W. W. 3. He denies that W. W. 3 worked with the second party up to 25th August 1967. In the evidence of W W. 3 he accepted his signature to Ex. W 4 (a) He denies having received any sum when he put his signature to Ex W. 3 and he admits having received Rs. 30 and odd or Rs 28 and odd when he put his signature as per Ex W. 4 (a). It is contended on behalf of the second party that if W. W. 3 had not given up his work and settled his claim he would not have put his signature to Ex W 3 and as per Ex. W. 4 (a) and received atleast the admitted amount as stated by W. W. 3. Nodoubt it is not clear why W. W 3 received the admitted amount as stated by him. But that itself is not sufficient to come to the conclusion that W. W. 3 voluntarily gave up his job and settled his claim. From

the perusal of Ex. W. 3 it is seen that the sum paid to W. W. 3 at the time when he signed it is not mentioned. It is stated that he received his dues towards wages up to date in full settlement along with leave with wages upto his working period. What was the leave that was to his credit is not stated. What was the sum that was paid towards the leave wages that was to his credit, there is no evidence. It is not explained by M. W. 2 as to why the sum that was paid to W. W. 3 at the time when he took his signature to Ex. W. 3 was not stated in it. The period of service that is noted in Ex. W. 3 is in ink from 1st December 1966 to 21st August 1967. The remaining portion is typed. Why this particular portion is written in ink is not explained. Who is its author is also not explained. Ex. W. 3 is also not attested by any witnesses. W W. 3 asserts that he has not put the date as 21st August 1967 in Ex W. 3 on the revenue stamp. If this is the case it is not explained who exactly is the person who put the the said date. According to W W. 3 his signature was taken stating that his leave with wages would be paid. From the facts and circumstances of the case this version of W. W. 3 appears to be more probable If the relevant entry relating to W. W. 3 in Ex. W. 4 is looked into it will be seen that the version of M. Ws. 1 and 2 stating that W. W. 3 left his service on 21st August 1967 cannot be believed. In Ex. W. 4 against the name of W. W. 3 absent marks are noted from 22nd August 1967 to 26th August 1967. If W W 3 had really settled his accounts and left his service on 21st August 1967 itself it is highly improbable that absent marks would have been put against his name from 22nd August 1967 to 26th August 1967. In the course of the evidence of M. W. 2 he admits that he cannot give the reason as to why W. W. 3 was marked absent from 22nd August 1967 to 26th August 1997 if he had already left his service on 21st August 1967. It could not also be understood why if W. W. 3 had left his service on 21st Augut 1967 itself, it was not specifically pleadsde in the rejoinder filed on behalf of the second party. Therefore it is clear that the entry made in Ex. W. 4 as per Ex. M. 1 stating that W. W. 3 left the service from 21st August 1967 must have been made later on to suit the purpose of the second party. As admitted by M. W. 1 in respect of the attendance of one Aswatha there is over-writing from 2nd August 1967 to 12th August 1967. He admits that in respect of the attendance of W. W. 2 in respect of the date 15th July 1967 to 20th July 1967 first he marked him absent even though he was present and later on W.W. 2 fought with him and got his attendance for that period marked present. In respect of one Krishnappa it was suggested to M. W. 1 that originally in respect of the dates from 8th August 1967 to 12th August 1967 he was marked present and later on it was altered as absent. M. W. 1 has denied the same. But from the perusal of the relevant entry in respect of the said Krishnappa in Ex. W 4 it is seen that originally the said Krishnappa had been marked present from 8th August 1967 to 12th August 1967 and later that mark is changed as absent. The

manner in which M. W. 1 has deposed it would be clear that he is not coming forward with truth. The manner in which Ex. W. 4 is maintained I do not think that much value can be placed on the entries made therein. M. W. 2 is the husband of the proprietrix of the second party. His version is also interested. The manner in which he has deposed before this court I am satisfied that he is not coming forward with truth. Hence no reliance can be placed on his evidence. From this fact it is clear that the second party has failed to establish that W. W. 3 voluntarily left his job after settling his claims with the second party on 21st August 1967.

14. Now it will have to be seen whether the second party has established that W. Ws. 1 and 3 and the other two workers namely Thimmakka and Lakshmi voluntarily left the service of the second Party at the instance of W.W. 2 Venkataramu or whether their services were unjustifiably terminated. In the rejoinder of the second party it is started that W. W. 2 has with vengence withdrawn the other workmen from the service of the second party without any justification whatsoever with the hop of foisting a case of dismissal and making extravagent demands for compensation and back wages and also with a view to kill the industry on account of anticapitalistic views of the first party. But on the course of the evidence of W. Ws. 1 & 3 they deny that they left the service of the second party at the instance of W. W 2 There is nothing to show that W.W. 2 instigated W.Ws. 1 and 3 and the other two workers Thimmakka an Lakshmi to abandon their services. It appears to be highly improbable that W. Ws 1 and 3 Thimmakka and Lakshmi would have abandoned their services just to support the cause of W.W. 2 If really they wanted to support the cause of W. W. 2 they could have resorted to launching a strike instead of abandoning their services If the facts and circumstances of the case are looked into the theory put forth by the second party that W. Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi abandoned their service at the instance of W. W 2 could not be true. W W 2 as the Secretary of the first party union has sent a letter dated 24th August 1967 to the second party stating that it was reported that the services of Thimmakka and Lakshmi were terminated unjustifiably with effect from 18th August 1967. He has also sent another letter to the second party dated 30th August 1967 stating that it was reported that unjustifiably the second party terminated the services of Muthu (W. W. 1), Aswatha, and Ranganatha with effect from 22nd August 1967 and W.W. 3 Bylappa with effect from 25th August 1967. No reply is sent in respect of the said two letters. In the rejoinder it is stated that the first party wrote undignified, false and threatening letters and the management ignored the letters as they contained patent falsehoods. From the perusal of Ex. W 1 and W. 2 it will be seen that there is nothing undignified or threatening in the language used in the said two letters. In the course of the evidence of M.W. 2 a different version is given. M.W. 2 states

that he received a letter from the first party union and he gave the letter to Sri Puttananjappa the Secretary of the Employers, Association there is notging to substantiate this fact. Even during conciliation proceedings the second party did not participate. In the rejoinder filed on behalf of the second party it is stated that the second party after it received a notice from the couciliation officer it approached the Mysore State Employers, Association and became a member of it and the Secretary of the said Association who was representing the second party asked for an adjournment as he could not attend unavoidably on 23rd February 1968 and that the proceedings were closed without any opportunity being given to the second party. There is nothing to show that the second party entrusted the matter to the Secretary of the Employers Association. Even in the course of the evidence of M. W. 2 he does not state a word about it. From these facts it is seen that if really W.Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi had voluntarily abandoned their services and if they had sent letters like Ex. W. 1 and W. 2 and also initiated conciliation proceedings. I do not think that the second party would have kept quiet. It is also not explained why if the above said workmen had voluntarily abandoned their services the second party failed to issue noices to them stating that they had abandoned their servies From the perusal of Ex. W. 4 in respect of August 1967 it is seen that in respect of several workmen who left their services it is noted that they left their services. In respect of W. W, 1, Thimmakka and Lakshmi it is not stated in Ex. W. 4 that they had left their services voluntarily. It is not explained by the second party, if they had left their services voluntarily who it was not noted against their names stating that they had left their services. If W. Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi had voluntarily left their services it appears to be highly improbable that immediately after they are alleged to have left their service they would have sent notices to the second party as per Ex. W. 1 and W. 2. In the course of the evidence of M. W. 2 he attempted to make out that he sent for the first party workmen and in spite of it they did not turn up. This fact is not stated in the rejoinder Only for the first time this version is set up in the course of the evidence of M. W. 2. There is nothing to show that M.W. 2. sent for the first party workmen except the interested testimony of M. W. 2. I do not think that this version can be accepted. Taking the facts and the circumstances of the case into consideration as referred to above it is clear that W. Ws. 1 and 3 Thimmakka and Lakshmi could not have abandoned their services with the second party and the second party terminated their services.

15 Now it will have to be seen whether the second party is justified in terminating the services of W.Ws. 1 and 2 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi. In the course of the evidence of W.W. 2 he states that a union was started in April 1967 : the workers of the second party are the members of that union : he complained to the Factories Inspector to enforce labour laws: on account of his trade union

activities his services were terminated in August 1967, in that behalf a dispute was raised which was referred to this court in Reference No. 3/68, this court ordered his reinstatement with back wages; thereafter he was taken on duty and once again his services were terminated on account of his labour union activities. W.W. 1 states that the second party was hostile to the union for the reasons stated by W.W. 2 and for his union activities his services also were terminated. W.W. 3 states that the services of himself, W.W. 1, Thimmakka and Lakshmi were terminated because they joined the union. From the facts available it will be seen that one after the other the services of W.Ws. 1 and 3, Thimmakka and Lakshmi were terminated in the month of August 1967. The manner in which their services are terminated one after the other without issuing charge-sheets and without holding any enquiry it is clear that the termination of their services is due to their union activities and it amounts to unfair labour practice and victimisation. Hence the termination is unjustified.

16. It is contended on behalf of the second party that in this case Thimmakka and Lakshmi are not examined; since they did not step into the witness box and depose that they did not abandon their services and their services were terminated, it cannot be stated that it is established that they did not abandon their services, but the second party terminated their services. From the clear evidence available as discussed above stating that W.Ws. 1 and 3 Thimmakka and Lakshmi did not abandon their services and the second party terminated their services, the non-examination of Thimmakka and Lakshmi does not affect the case.

17 It is contended on behalf of the second party that the proprietrix of the second party closed the concern and leased the looms and the premises to one Srinivasappa as per Ext.W. 5. Hence the question of reinstatement of W.Ws. 1 and 2 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi does not arise. It is contended on behalf of the first party that Ex. W. 5 is got up to deprive W-Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi of reinstatement. Now it will have to be seen whether as contended on behalf of the second party the closure of the second party factory is true. The burden is heavily upon the second party to prove this fact. M.W. 1 in the course of his examination-in chief states that the factory of the second party was closed about 4 months ago. M.W. 1 was examined on 16th June 1970. From this fact it will be seen according to M.W. 1 the factory was closed on or about 19th February 1970. In the course of the evidence of M.W. 2 he gives a different version stating that the factory was closed in December 1969. It is admitted that the factory is being run in the same place using the same looms. In the course of the cross-examination of M.W. 1 he admits that Srinivasappa, who is alleged to be the lessee under W. 5,

is the maistry in Parvathi Silk Weaving Factory of which M. W. 2 is the proprietor. M. W. 2 gives a different version stating that the said Srinivasappa is not working as a maistry in his factory known as Parvathi Silk Weaving Factory. M. W. 2 attempted to make out that none of the persons who were working in the second party factory is working in the factory now stated to be run by the said Srinivasapp In the course of the evidence of W. W. 2 he states that in the said factory at the time when the closure notice was served on him 18 persons were working. The others were not served with closure notice. Ranganathan is one of the workmen concerned in this case who had also been terminated and who has subsequently settled the matter with the second party. The said Ranganathan is still working in the factory. This version is not challenged. Except Ex. W. 5 there is no other document to show that Srinivasappa is actually running the second party factory independently. Surprisingly enough the said Srinivasappa and Krishnamma the proprietrix of the second party factory as also the attestors to Ex. W. 5 who are important witnesses are not examined. No reasons are offered for their non-examination. From the evidence available it will be seen that the second party has failed to prove that the second party closed the second party factory and it is leased to Srinivasappa under Ex. W. 5. The manner in which Ex. W. 5 has come into existence after this reference is made it appears to me that it is only a nominal document and no reliance can be placed on it. Since the second party has filed to prove closure of the second party factory W. Ws. and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi are entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service.

18. The next point for consideration is what is the back wages that should be granted to W. Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi. It is contended on behalf of the second party that they are already employed elsewhere and they are earning and as such they will not be entitled for back wages. In the course of their evidence W. Ws. 1 and 3 have denied that they are working elsewhere and are eking out their livelihood. The second party has not let in any evidence to show that W. Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi are working elsewhere and are earning. I do not think that it would be justifiable to deny them their entire back wages. Hence taking all the facts and circumstances of the case into consideration, I am of opinion that it would meet with ends of justice if W. Ws. 1 and 3 and Thimmakka and Lakshmi are granted fifty per cent of their back wages from the dates of their termination to the dates of their reinstatement.

19. In the result I make an award directing the second party management to reinstate with continuity of services G. Muthu, Thimmakka, Lakshmi and Bylappa in their former posts and further

pay them fifty per cent of their back wages from the dates of their termination to the dates of their reinstatement. No costs.

A. N. SUNDARA MURTHY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Bangalore.

ORDER

Bangalore, dated the 22nd March 1971.

S.O. No. 787—Whereas by State Government Order No. FCL 473 LLD 68, dated 8th October 1968 the Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the management of Saroja Textiles, No. 5, Ganigar 'C' Lane, Cubbonpet, Bangalore-2 was referred to the Labour Court, Bangalore for adjudication.

And, whereas, the Labour Court has submitted to the State Government its award in respect of the said Industrial Dispute.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 17 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government of Mysore are pleased to direct the publication of the said award as above, in the *Mysore Gazette.*

[Order No. FCL 38 LLA 71]

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Mysore,

ANIRUDHA DESAI,
Under Secretary to Government,
Food, Civil Supplies and Labour Department.

2127